



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,332	07/05/2005	Mark Shuster	25791.119.03	3641
78/091 Conley Rose, P.C. P.O. Box 3267 Houston, TX 77253-3267	7590 04/17/2008		<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>STEPHENSON, DANIEL P</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>3676</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE</div> <div>04/17/2008</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/525,332		SHUSTER ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	DANIEL P. STEPHENSON		3676	

All Participants:

(1) DANIEL P. STEPHENSON.

(2) Michael LeMan.

Date of Interview: 9 April 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 5:00

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner related to the applicant that there appeared to be conflicting specifications (2/22/05 and 11/22/05), and that one of the specifications (2/22/05) had a blank space where there should be an application number. The examiner also pointed out that one of the specifications (2/22/05) had the correct 371 priority claim, but also incorrectly claimed the case as being a continuation-in-part. The applicant replied that the specification from 2/22/05 was the correct specification and authorized the removal of paragraph 2 of the specification, which contained the blank space and the improper continuation-in-part claim, through an examiner's amendment.